

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 and 14 have been examined and rejected on prior art grounds.

Specification

The Examiner has objected to the abstract as exceeding 150 words and allegedly no longer accurately and concisely reflecting the claimed invention. The Examiner has also objected to the specification as allegedly being replete with errors and therefore failing to describe the invention in full, clear, concise, and exact terms.

Applicant amends the abstract to reduce the word count to less than 150 words. Applicants submit that the Abstract still accurately and concisely reflects the claimed invention. The specification is also amended to address the informalities noted by the Examiner. A substitute specification pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.125(a) is provided with this Amendment. Applicants submit that the substitute specification includes no new matter. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawings as allegedly failing to show every feature of the invention as specified by the claims. This objection is respectfully traversed.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner enumerates the system components of the claims which are required to be shown as follows: 1) a service status detecting unit, 2) a customer product information storage device, 3) a sales promoting terminal, and 4) a

manufacturing point terminal. Applicants submit that each of these components are shown in the drawings at least for the following reasons.

Regarding the service status detecting unit, Applicant directs the Examiner to Figure 1 which shows server terminals 40-60. Referring to paragraph 32 of the specification, software serving to detect a service status can be installed to the server terminals 40-60 as the service status detecting means. Thus, the first system component (the service status detecting unit) is shown.

Regarding the customer product information storage device, paragraph 32 of the specification also discloses that the customer product information storage device can be a memory of the server terminals 40-60. Moreover, Figure 7 shows this customer product information storage device 41 which is disposed in server terminal 40 as clearly disclosed at least by paragraph 32 of the specification. Thus, the second system component (the customer product information storage device) is shown by the figures. Page 10 of the Office Action indicates that “the Examiner almost laughs” at newly submitted Figure 7. Critically, the Examiner has not indicated why the drawing is unacceptable, nor has the Examiner cited any authority supporting such an assertion. Applicants submit that Figure 7 is fully supported by the original disclosure and complies with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 1.84. Furthermore, as discussed above, the figure clearly shows a component of the claimed system.

Regarding the claimed sales promoting terminal and manufacturing point terminal, these features are clearly shown in Figure 1 as reference numerals 40-60 and 71-73, respectively. Thus, the third and fourth system components are shown.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the drawings show all of the system components of the claims. Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of this objection or at least further information from the Examiner regarding what system component is not allegedly shown properly.

Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to claims 1-12 and 14, for various informalities. The informalities noted by the Examiner have been corrected. Thus, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-12 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement and the enablement requirement. Applicants submit that the claims comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-12 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Applicants submit that the claims comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-8 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Kodimer. Applicants submit that the claims are patentable.

For example, claim 1 recites a sales promoting terminal which receives supply information from a manufacturing point terminal based on service status and sends purchase order information and retail store specifying information to the manufacturing point terminal in response to the received supply information.

Conversely, Kodimer is directed to a system in which a condition of a network peripheral device is detected, status information is obtained, and an IP-packet requesting service and containing the status information is sent to a service organization (col. 12, lines 44-51). The service may be a purchase order request for delivery of a new part (col. 12, lines 55-65).

Kodimer does not teach that the purchase order request is sent to the service organization in response to any supply information received from the service organization. In fact, Kodimer is silent about any supply information being received. Moreover, Kodimer does not teach that retail store specifying information is sent to the service organization. Thus, Kodimer does not teach the claimed sales promoting terminal which receives supply information from a manufacturing point terminal based on service status and sends purchase order information and retail store specifying information to the manufacturing point terminal in response to the received supply information.

Because Kodimer does not teach all of the features of claim 1, Applicants submit that the claim is not anticipated by Kodimer and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Independent claims 2 and 14 recite similar features to those discussed above in conjunction with claim 1. Therefore, Applicant submits that these claims are patentable for reasons analogous to those discussed above regarding claim 1. Applicant further submits that claims 3-12, being dependent on claims 1 or 2, are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 9-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kodimer in view of Microsoft Computer Dictionary in further view of Official Notice. Because these claims are dependent on one of claims 1 and 2, and because Microsoft Computer Dictionary and the Examiner's Official Notice do not cure Kodimer's deficient teachings, Applicants submit that claims 9-12 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Patent Application No. 09/928,451

Q65793

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER


Sean M. Conner
Registration No. 60,840

Date: February 7, 2008